

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DRAFT REPOSITORY SEIS
and
DRAFT NEVADA RAIL CORRIDOR SEIS
AND DRAFT RAIL ALIGNMENT EIS

PUBLIC SCOPING COMMENTS

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Taken at the Hawthorne Convention Center
932 E Street
Hawthorne, Nevada

On Tuesday, November 13, 2007
At 4:00 p.m.

Reported by: Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR

	1	COMMENTER	PAGE
	2	BOB HALSTEAD	3
	3	PAUL SEIDLER	11
	4	DAVID BLEE	17
	5	DAVID BALERIA	21
	6		
	7		
	8		
	9		
	10		
	11		
	12		
	13		
	14		
	15		
	16		
	17		
	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		

1 BOB HALSTEAD: Good evening. Thank you all
2 of you who came to this public meeting. And we very
3 much appreciate the fact that the Department of
4 Energy has decided to go back to this hearing format,
5 which some of you will remember has not been done for
6 a few years because of the court reporter mechanism.
7 So we believe this is a much better way to have
8 people speak to one another about these important
9 issues.

10 My name is Bob Halstead. I'm transportation
11 advisor for the State of Nevada Agency for Nuclear
12 Projects in Carson City. This is the state agency
13 that is responsible under state law for representing
14 the state in its interactions with the Department of
15 Energy regarding the entire Yucca Mountain project.

16 Tonight we're going to be talking about some
17 narrow, specific aspects of the Yucca Mountain
18 repository project. And the way we've designed our
19 comments, all of which are preliminary at this point,
20 because, like most of you, we've only had access to
21 the documents for about five weeks, we're still
22 developing our detailed comments.

23 Before I go any further, I'd like to say for
24 anybody in the audience who would like to contact us,
25 and we would certainly invite you to share your views

1 on the DOE project so we can include them in the
2 State's views, and also we'd be happy to just provide
3 you with any information that we can. The telephone
4 number is (775)687-3744. It's hard to read e-mail
5 addresses to people. Anybody who wants the e-mail
6 address, please see me later in the meeting, but it's
7 www.state.nv.us/nucwaste with a C.

8 I'd like to start with some comments on the
9 TAD canister system, and then when I'll be speaking
10 for Steve in that second slot, we'll talk
11 specifically about the rail alignment.

12 It's important to understand that the
13 supplemental EIS is required because, and its focused
14 primarily on the proposal to use a new hardware
15 system, the so-called TAD (transport aging and
16 disposal) canister system for storage, transportation
17 and disposal. This introduces a number of
18 uncertainties into the environmental review and the
19 licensing process for the entire repository.

20 Based on our preliminary review, the State
21 has concluded that the proposed action in the use of
22 these TAD canisters cannot be evaluated under NEPA
23 because the Draft Supplemental EIS doesn't provide
24 enough specific information. Specifically you'll
25 notice there aren't any final designs for the TAD

1 canisters and they're over-passed. Proof of concept
2 design have been developed by the contractors and we
3 don't know whether when June of next year comes
4 around and DOE puts the license in we'll see detailed
5 designs.

6 The cost and financial arrangements for
7 these TAD systems haven't been worked out. The
8 systems are not compatible with the dry storage
9 technologies that utilities are using for the most
10 part as we discussed the current systems with the
11 utilities.

12 And, indeed, it's not clear that the
13 utilities are actually going to use the TAD system;
14 and moreover, if you read closely the no action
15 alternative that DOE is supposed to put forward says,
16 well, if we don't go forward with the TAD, DOE would
17 not construct a repository at Yucca Mountain.

18 So this notion, this hardware system has the
19 potential to completely change the basis of whether
20 or not DOE has to license the repository.

21 Let me also point out the complications that
22 the TAD system creates for repository transportation.
23 It's so large and heavy that it virtually requires
24 rail transportation. Yucca Mountain lacks rail
25 access. The estimated cost for building the Caliente

1 railroad has gone up from an estimate of \$800 million
2 in 2002 to somewhere in the range of a little over
3 2 billion to a little over 3 billion in 2007.

4 There's strong opposition to building this
5 railroad in Nevada. If it's built it's likely to be
6 significantly delayed. One-third of the shipping
7 sites don't have the ability to ship their waste out
8 by rail, so there are all these exotic plans for
9 using barges or 200-foot long heavy haul truck rigs
10 to move them.

11 There are also new post 9-11 security
12 concerns about shipping high-level nuclear waste
13 through highly populated urban areas, which of course
14 is necessary to make cross-country shipments on the
15 rail line if we use the current interchange yards.

16 So there are a whole bunch of transportation
17 uncertainties that come out of this proposal to use a
18 new hardware system, as well as the uncertainty about
19 licensing the repository itself.

20 Finally, before I turn to talking about the
21 railroad, let me just list some issues about safety
22 and security that the State does not believe are
23 adequately addressed in the Draft EIS. One, DOE does
24 not consider worst case transportation accidents.

25 I appreciate the fact that they spelled out

1 their thinking in this regard. They said a
2 combination of the factors for worst case accidents
3 are, quote, not reasonably foreseeable, but that
4 doesn't mean that those accidents can't occur, and
5 that was one of the things that we'll be addressing
6 in detail in our written comments in January.

7 In particular with accidents the
8 consequences of long duration, high temperature fires
9 in rail environments are at issue. We believe that
10 the DOE analysis regarding terrorist attacks is good
11 in the sense that it acknowledges the vulnerability
12 of the shipments by terrorist attacks, it's not so
13 good in that it has constrained those attacks.
14 Again, we'll be developing very detailed written
15 comments in that area.

16 There are two specific issues in
17 transportation risk analysis that concern us. Again
18 we appreciate the fact that you spelled that out very
19 clearly in the EIS, so you know where it conflicts
20 between DOE and the nuclear industry on the one hand
21 and the State of Nevada.

22 One is DOE dismisses the potential for human
23 errors to exacerbate the consequences of the
24 accidents. So things like were the lid bolts
25 properly torqued, was there an accident, was there a

1 mistake in design, was there a mistake in fabrication
2 of the package and so forth. These are things that
3 we've documented in the past that we believe are
4 important.

5 A second specific risk analysis issue is
6 that DOE says we've taken this general approach that
7 we think captures all the bad things that can happen.
8 Our position is in any specific route that's chosen
9 there are unique local conditions that can make an
10 accident much worse than what we might have
11 anticipated in a more general assessment.

12 Finally, we do want to point out that the
13 DOE does acknowledge in appendix G, which if you get
14 to there it's about eight or 900 pages, that the
15 cleanup after a very severe accident could be as high
16 as \$10 billion. That's worth keeping in mind.

17 One other issue about the general
18 transportation, we're going to submit for the record
19 a copy of the map that we prepared. The map that
20 show the cross-country routes possibly underestimate
21 the impacts of shipments from across the country on
22 Reno and Las Vegas, whether the Mina or the Caliente
23 routes are chosen. And I'm not going to go into
24 great detail about that tonight, but anybody who
25 wants to discuss that, I'll be around later.

1 Let me turn quickly to some general comments
2 with the EIS on the rail alignment. And it's hard to
3 know what we're talking about here because this is
4 definitely the longest type of document that I have
5 ever seen. You know, it's actually two documents in
6 one. So I'm going to talk about both of those rail
7 documents together.

8 First, we don't believe DOE has yet provided
9 information to support the selection of the Caliente
10 corridor as their preferred corridor.

11 Second, we think that they're wrong to go
12 forward with the consideration of the Mina corridor
13 as a nonpreferred alternative, given that the Walker
14 River Paiute tribe has withdrawn their support.

15 Third general issue, we believe that DOE's
16 selection of the shared use option means that DOE
17 should now ask the Surface and Transportation Board,
18 which is the regulatory body that would normally
19 regulate common carrier railroad, they should
20 actually ask the STB not just to be a cooperating
21 agency but to be the lead agency in preparing the
22 EIS.

23 Fourth, there is a contention in the EIS
24 that the shipments that aren't made by rail would be
25 made by overweight trucks rather than legal weight

1 trucks. We don't find any evidence or references to
2 substantiate that. To the extent that there is a
3 long record of transportation of spent fuel in this
4 country, about 80 to 90 percent of the shipments that
5 have been made are by legal weight trucks.

6 And, finally, we believe the no alternative,
7 the no action alternative for the EIS should be the
8 mostly legal weight truck scenario that was presented
9 in the 2002 Final EIS.

10 Let me quickly make three points about the
11 Mina rail corridor and the way that it's been
12 evaluated in these documents. First, we don't
13 believe the DOE has adequately assessed all of the
14 environmental impacts of constructing the rail
15 corridor, in particularly that portion that involves
16 the relocation of the existing rail line, which is
17 primarily where it goes across the Walker River
18 Paiute Reservation.

19 Secondly, we don't believe that DOE has
20 assessed, in fact we know it hasn't assessed the
21 environmental impacts of developing the Mina rail
22 corridor on the communities along the existing rail
23 lines in Northern Nevada that would be along the
24 feeder lines that come down to Hazen where the
25 connection would be made for the Schurz Mina route.

1 And, finally, DOE has not assessed the
2 potential for larger than projected numbers of rail
3 shipments if Mina were to be developed on the
4 Reno/Sparks area. And they've also failed to look at
5 unique local conditions in that area, the best
6 example which is probably, for those of you who know
7 Reno, the rail trench in downtown Reno. Thank you
8 very much for the opportunity to give these comments.

9 PAUL SEIDLER: Hi, thank you. My name is
10 Paul Seidler. I've raised four children here in
11 Nevada. I'm the senior director with the Nuclear
12 Energy Institute here in Nevada based out of Las
13 Vegas. I could be reached at pes@nei.org, if anybody
14 has any reason to reach me if you're interested in
15 anything about the nuclear industry.

16 NEI is the trade association for the nuclear
17 industry. Our members include key universities
18 around the United States, most of the major utilities
19 in the United States, radiopharmaceuticals and other
20 major vendors such as GE, Westinghouse, major vendors
21 to the nuclear industry.

22 Nuclear power provides electricity to one
23 out of five homes in the United States and businesses
24 in the United States.

25 I'll be very brief today. I'll just hit on

1 some of the key points with regard to the SEIS for
2 both the repository and the transportation.

3 Before I go into that I'll tell you a little
4 bit about myself. I worked on this issue on behalf
5 of state government. I've worked for the federal
6 government on the project. I've worked for local
7 government in Nevada on this project. I've also
8 actually shipped spent nuclear fuel and have been an
9 escort for spent fuel shipments and involved in the
10 inspections of spent nuclear fuel shipments.

11 Many people might be surprised, we have
12 about 3,000, to 4,000 shipments in the United States
13 alone of spent nuclear fuel. We've had 24,000
14 shipments internationally of spent nuclear fuel. We
15 know how to do it. We have an extremely safe record
16 and believe that based upon the regulations and the
17 very rugged nature of the containers that are used to
18 transport spent nuclear fuel that the safety record
19 would continue to be exceptional.

20 On the table in the back I have plenty of
21 information for folks on transportation and NEI.
22 Feel free to stop by on the way out. Also, if you
23 want to reach me directly, my phone number is area
24 code (702)239-4427. That's my personal cell phone.
25 Please feel free to give me a call if there's

1 anything I could add regarding Yucca Mountain to the
2 comments that I make today.

3 Regarding the draft supplemental EIS for the
4 geological repository at Yucca Mountain, I want to
5 start by letting you know that Yucca Mountain is
6 vitally important to the national interest and is a
7 key element of an integrated approach to safe
8 management of used nuclear fuel.

9 This project is very important to my
10 industry. We believe that the strategy to managing
11 used fuels in the country should involve many
12 elements, including the existing safe storage at
13 reactors. We do it safely in both spent fuel pools
14 and in dry storage at reactors around the United
15 States.

16 To give you an idea of what that means,
17 roughly half of Americans live within 75 miles of the
18 existing reactors. So we have a lot of people living
19 very near nuclear power plants. To give you an idea,
20 Yucca Mountain is 90 miles from Las Vegas. That
21 gives you sort of a sense of the sort of distances
22 that we're talking about in closeness of population
23 to these facilities. In other words, we're used to
24 having populations very near our facilities. It's
25 something that we deal with, and we do operate these

1 plants safely and protect the public health and
2 safety.

3 Anyways, the other elements of used fuel
4 storage are we see recycling as having a major role
5 and ultimately a repository down the road. Recycling
6 technology is still evolving. It's used around the
7 world very successfully. We believe that there are
8 better technologies in the pipeline perhaps 20, 30
9 years down the road that will significantly reduce
10 the amount of materials going into Yucca Mountain.

11 We'll still need Yucca Mountain for spent
12 nuclear fuel for the residual products. We'll still
13 need Yucca Mountain for the defense waste. A good
14 deal of our national defense relies heavily on the
15 need of a repository, particularly the nuclear navy.

16 The design and changes to the updated
17 analytical methods reflected in the Yucca Mountain
18 supplemental EIS represents substantial improvements,
19 enhancements to what was already a very strong safety
20 phase to provide even greater contents in the safety
21 of Yucca Mountain. The surface facilities have been
22 greatly simplified, reducing possibilities for
23 employee exposure. The TADs reduce handling of spent
24 nuclear fuel. Bob spoke briefly about the TADs.

25 By the way, the industry has been very

1 actively involved in participating in the development
2 of the multipurpose containers that we call TADs, and
3 they will make the simplified facilities at Yucca
4 Mountain possible, thus making the repository that
5 much more safe.

6 The information in the SEIS appears to
7 provide a strong indication that DOE has completed
8 sufficient design and analytical work to enable the
9 completion of a thorough and high-quality application
10 to the NRC for a license application.

11 Basically where the project is at right now
12 is we're on the cusp of submitting a license
13 application that will kick off a multiyear process,
14 perhaps a four-year process, where the Nuclear
15 Regulatory Commission, an independent regulatory
16 agency of the federal government, to review the
17 application to determine whether or not the
18 department has made its safety case.

19 We believe in that process. It's an
20 extremely transparent process. The Department of
21 Energy has several million documents on line for you
22 to look at in relation to the support network. So
23 that you have the access, you can see the information
24 that the Department of Energy is using to make its
25 safety case. Very transparent, legalistic type

1 process that will go on right here in Nevada.

2 The NRC has set up a hearing facility in
3 Nevada, and the affected use of the government and
4 the state of Nevada will be active participants in
5 that process.

6 Regarding the draft supplemental EIS for
7 transportation, I've already talked about the
8 shipping history in the United States and
9 internationally. I'm not going to go through that in
10 greater detail. Like I said earlier, I have plenty
11 of information in the back for you regarding the
12 processes that we go through to test the things that
13 are used and the safety record.

14 The EIS for transportation shows basically
15 that the impacts to Nevada for transportation will be
16 very small. And, frankly, that's consistent with our
17 experience here in the United States and it's
18 consistent with the international experience. The
19 impact will likely be very small.

20 The real opportunity is on the upside. It's
21 the favorable opportunities, and they're tremendous,
22 frankly. The Department of Energy is going to be
23 making, as Bob alluded to earlier, a massive
24 investment in nuclear transportation infrastructure
25 in the United States, and that represents an

1 incredible economic opportunity if we approach it
2 from the right direction. To me that's the majority
3 of the impact that we're going to see on the
4 transportation side are the favorable variety.

5 The DOE should begin constructing the
6 railroad as soon as possible to make sure that that
7 facility is available, not only for the operation of
8 the repository but for the construction of the
9 repository. We're talking about a facility that has
10 a life cycle cost of upwards of 60, \$70 million.
11 This is a huge investment in Nevada, tremendous
12 economic opportunity, and the railroad can play an
13 important role in creating that opportunity. Thank
14 you very much.

15 DAVID BLEE: Thank you. My name is David
16 Blee, executive director of the U.S. Transport
17 Council. It's great to be back in Hawthorne. I was
18 fortunate to work with Shelley Hartman and Linda
19 Mathias on that project. It's great to see you all
20 again. You do a very good job for the community.

21 And first I wanted to speak to something
22 that Paul Seidler just talked about. He said that
23 the transportation will have a small impact on the
24 community, well, correctly talking about the major
25 upside economically.

1 I want to read to you the definition of
2 small from the EIS. It says, Small: Small is
3 defined for the issue, Environmental effects would
4 not be detectable or would be so minor that they
5 would neither be stabilized or noticeably alter any
6 important attribute of the resource. So that's just
7 for the record, as everyone has their own definition
8 of small.

9 I'd like to say the U.S. Transport Council
10 is pleased to offer some preliminary comments on the
11 NEPA documents. It is our intent to submit final
12 comments in writing on or before January 10th, 2008
13 as proposed.

14 I will say that we find this document
15 comprehensive and thorough, these documents
16 comprehensive and thorough. We believe they laid the
17 groundwork for submittal of the license application
18 and they have crossed all the Ts and dotted all the
19 I's necessary.

20 The USTC is a not for profit non-lobbying
21 organization comprised of approximately 30 nuclear
22 materials transporters, customers and associated
23 industries. One of the key things to remember about
24 the USTC is the depth of experience of its members
25 who represents a who's who of the transportation

1 industry.

2 Collectively the USTC members have already
3 transported more spent fuel safely and securely than
4 is currently earmarked for Yucca Mountain. Our
5 mission is to preserve, protect and defend the safety
6 and secure commerce of nuclear materials through
7 education, public awareness, and consensus building.

8 We do so by letting the facts speak for
9 themselves and by reminding Americans of the
10 important benefits derived from nuclear energy with
11 regard to economic competitiveness, energy and
12 national security and environmental progress.

13 Obviously it provides 20 percent of our
14 electricity in the United States. It provides clean
15 energy, which people are finding more and more
16 important, and is a lynchpin of our economic
17 competitiveness with the world. And I think, as Paul
18 Seidler mentioned, it powers a key portion of our
19 U.S. Navy nuclear fleet.

20 With regard to our general observations with
21 respect to the NEPA issues, we believe affected
22 communities can have high confidence in the
23 feasibility of the proposed approach for spent fuel
24 and high-level waste management at the Yucca Mountain
25 site and the safe, secure transportation of nuclear

1 fuels to the site via the Nevada rail corridor and/or
2 by truck.

3 The USTC believes that the proposed
4 transport aging and disposal system, i.e., the TAD,
5 offers a sound fuel management paradigm and provides
6 important linkage to the more than 120 interim
7 storage sites around the country. It is, in fact,
8 very compatible with the existing systems. It's
9 really an adaptation of currently employed systems at
10 the utility plants. It's of the same way as
11 currently deployed systems and it's very flexible and
12 versatile.

13 The public should also have full confidence
14 in the fact that nuclear materials can be transported
15 safely and securely to Yucca Mountain.

16 This past year the National Academy of
17 Sciences completed a nearly three year study of the
18 viability of the national transport campaign to Yucca
19 Mountain. It's this report here called Going the
20 Distance - The Safe Transport of Spent Nuclear Fuel
21 and High-Level Radioactive Waste in the United
22 States.

23 The National Academy report concluded that
24 there are no fundamental barriers, quote, No
25 fundamental barriers to the safe transport of spent

1 fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the United
2 States, end quote.

3 There are numerous reasons for this
4 conclusion, including the tested experience of the
5 transport industry to the robustness of the transport
6 packages and the proven track record of regulatory
7 oversight provided by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
8 Commission, the U.S. Department of Transportation and
9 the states themselves in ensuring high standards of
10 security, safety and emergency preparedness that we
11 have today.

12 Let me close by saying that we've made a
13 special effort to reach out to Nevada stakeholders on
14 transportation issues. This is not only our mission
15 but we too are stakeholders in that part of the
16 nuclear waste policy act requires that the
17 transportation program be implemented by the private
18 sectors to the maximum extent, and so we look forward
19 to working with you and we look forward to answering
20 any questions you may have along the way. Thank you.

21 DAVID BALERIA: By way of introduction I'm
22 not anti-nuke nor antimilitary nor un-American. I
23 grew up here, I graduated here and may come back and
24 live here permanently sometime when we're through
25 full-time RV'ing.

1 But I'm very concerned about the health and
2 welfare of Hawthorne and central Nevada as a whole.
3 I'm concerned that the Yucca Mountain project will
4 come at the expense of Hawthorne and Mineral County
5 folks to benefit others in Las Vegas and particularly
6 the eastern United States, both places where they
7 don't want their own garbage or their own waste from
8 sewage to nuclear waste from reactors making
9 electricity for them.

10 Some facts. First, Nevada ranks among the
11 most seismically active states. The number of the
12 larger shocks produced some spectacular examples of
13 surface faulting, including quakes in Pleasant Valley
14 in 1915, Cedar Mountain in 1933, Excelsior Mountain
15 Range in 1934, Rainbow Mountain in 1954, and Fairview
16 Peak in 1954. Some of us who grew up in Hawthorne
17 remember the July through December 1954 quakes east
18 of Fallon, Nevada.

19 The Nevada Test Site in Southern Nevada is
20 the home of 928 nuclear tests during the Cold War
21 until the testing moratorium halted nuclear testing
22 in 1992. One hundred of the tests conducted south of
23 us were atmospheric tests dropped by aircraft,
24 explosive towers, balloons or cannons producing
25 well-known mushroom clouds and dangerous radioactive

1 fallout. Some of that fallout drifted to Hawthorne.

2 The present: Nuclear waste is currently
3 being stored in over 120 locations in 39 states,
4 according to the U.S. Department of Energy Office of
5 Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. Folks would
6 have you believe that it's all a very safe industry.
7 If it's that safe, why don't they keep their waste
8 where they generate their electricity?

9 Keep in mind that this is a federal agency
10 that does not particularly give a damn about
11 Hawthorne or Mineral County residents. It's a
12 federal agency, after all, and we know federal
13 agencies don't really care about rural Americans,
14 small town America. Few have ever lived in a town
15 under 30,000, let alone 3,000 folks. There's
16 probably two of us in this room tonight, my wife
17 being the other one, that has stayed in all 48 states
18 in this grand nation of ours.

19 If you look at the map on the OCRWM website
20 you will see that most of these storage sites are
21 east of the Missouri River, as they should be, but
22 they're filling. Tough. It's their waste, not
23 Nevada's nor Hawthorne's.

24 The massive U.S. population east of the
25 Missouri River, which is east of the great plains

1 states of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska,
2 Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas is a huge electrical use
3 area in the United States. Yet as with coal mining
4 and coal burning, they don't want that in their own
5 backyards. No, mine coal in Wyoming, ship it to some
6 Nevada old Indian reservation in the southwest and
7 burn it in a coal fired electrical generation
8 facility there, or in the heartland of America or in
9 the west, but ship that clean electricity back to the
10 east for those population centers.

11 Just as the rich and powerful don't want
12 wind power turbines at Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and
13 we know who some of those people are, disturbing
14 their views, they sure want cheap electrical energy,
15 made elsewhere of course.

16 And, God forbid, they don't want nuclear
17 reactors near them, or certainly the waste that will
18 be radioactive for 10,000 or more years stored near
19 their schools, their backyards or anywhere near their
20 pristine eastern towns. No, ship it off to what they
21 see as the wastelands of the rural deserts of Nevada,
22 a state many of them can't even correctly pronounce.

23 Just as Los Angeles managed to steal much
24 water from the north valley decades ago, and Las
25 Vegas is now trying to do with a huge pipe sucking

1 the underground water from rural central Nevada, now
2 the folks who live far from Nevada want to turn
3 Nevada into an even bigger radioactive waste dump.

4 I say no. Let them keep their own waste in
5 their own backyards. We have a gas and fuel crisis
6 in America. They want to ship how many tens of
7 thousands of tons, not pounds but tens of thousands
8 of tons of nuclear waste from all over the U.S. here
9 to Fernley and down to our town here in Hawthorne or
10 near our town on railroad cars, although that seems
11 to have changed if the Mina route is considered.

12 At least throughout Vegas does not present
13 the same adverse impact due to the massive increased
14 shipping data on our highways here. Las Vegas is
15 already an artificial city that should not exist,
16 which has far exceeded its own water resources
17 decades ago. If there's a nuclear spill down there
18 that kills thousands, well, they just won't have to
19 build the next 230,000 homes planned there. There's
20 already 30,000 homes on the sub prime scam market out
21 there now.

22 Hawthorne has already been near enough to
23 nuclear radiation. Many may not remember or even
24 know about the Shoals 12.5 kiloton nuclear shot 28
25 miles southeast of Fallon in 1963. That shot was

1 only 48 miles from Hawthorne. Or how about the 1968
2 1.2 megaton fault shot in the Warm Springs area to
3 our northeast. 828 nukes were fired underground at
4 the Nevada Test Site. Now they want to store 77,000 tons
5 of nuclear waste they want to store in our backyard
6 to 150,000 tons.

7 Fortunately the Mina rail route is out. It
8 seems our Native Americans have said no to it again.
9 Maybe seeing the dollar signs being hung out in front
10 of their faces isn't enough to give up what they
11 might lose.

12 Some in Hawthorne likely too see the dollar
13 signs of the Mina route particularly somehow. Will
14 the Yucca project bring jobs to Hawthorne? Not
15 likely. But will it bring other's nuclear waste from
16 all over this country right by our backyard? Yep.
17 What's in it for you? Very little, if anything.
18 Thank you.

19 (Thereupon the proceedings
20 were concluded at 7:00 p.m.)

21 * * * * *

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF NEVADA)

3 SS:

4 COUNTY OF CLARK.)

5 I, Deborah Ann Hines, certified court
6 reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in
7 shorthand (Stenotype) all of the proceedings had in
8 the before-entitled matter at the time and place
9 indicated; and that thereafter said shorthand notes
10 were transcribed into typewriting at and under my
11 direction and supervision and the foregoing
12 transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate
13 record of the proceedings had.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed
15 my hand this ____ day of _____, 2007.

16

17

18

19

Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

DRAFT REPOSITORY SEIS

6

AND

7

DRAFT NEVADA RAIL CORRIDOR SEIS

8

AND DRAFT RAIL ALIGNMENT EIS

9

PUBLIC COMMENTS

10

11

12

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

13

14

Taken at the Hawthorne Convention Center

15

932 E. Street

16

Hawthorne, Nevada

17

18

on Tuesday, November 13, 2006

19

at 4:00 p.m.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Reported by: Daren S. Bloxham, CCR No. 685, RPR

1	COMMENTER	PAGE
2		
3	CASH JASCZIK	3
4	CHARLES HOLLIS	7
5	PHILLIP KLEVORICK	8
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 --oOo--

3 CASH JASCZAK: My name is Cash Jaszak, Nevada
4 citizen. I live in Clark County, Nevada. And the
5 Yucca Mountain Project EIS and the Rail Supplement EIS
6 deserves some serious consideration from those of us who
7 are Nevada citizens.

8 The challenges we face in this state and in
9 the nation relative to the energy policy are all
10 dependent or in many ways dependent on how we deal with
11 closing the fuel cycle loop, and Yucca Mountain is at
12 the center of that.

13 It's at the center of that whether you have
14 the next generation of nuclear power or whether you
15 recycle. At some point you still need a repository. It
16 isn't a matter of if, it's a matter of when.

17 We in Nevada have the opportunity to turn this
18 lemon into lemonade, and we ought to do so. We ought to
19 consider at least three different things. We ought to
20 have an intervention process, we ought to have a
21 monitoring process, and we ought to have a benefits
22 process, all of which should be reviewed by a group of
23 citizens from Nevada, across Nevada, both parties, rural
24 and urban parts in the state to come up with the things
25 that we as Nevadans think that are important to us, and

1 then to have some idea of where those things can play

2 into helping Nevadans solve Nevada's problems while we
3 work for some energy independence for the nation.

4 Let me go into the intervention processes. We
5 believe as Nevadans, we probably ought -- this whole
6 effort ought to be as safe as it can be. But it can be
7 safe, and it takes good people working hard to do that.
8 And when all else fails, we'd like to have an
9 intervention policy or process in the state of Nevada.

10 Since the repository is going to be a nuclear
11 facility, it's operated under the guidelines of the
12 Nuclear Regulatory Commission who have stop work
13 authority.

14 And I have to believe that if we as Nevadans
15 were to work with the Department of Energy and the
16 Administration, we would probably have the opportunity
17 to find some way to be able to have stop work authority
18 on behalf of Nye County and the State of Nevada and all
19 the citizens of Nevada.

20 The second part would be a monitoring process.
21 The monitoring process has to be tied to the reality
22 that we want this to be a safe repository if it's going
23 to happen, and we believe that there's a need for it.

24 And in order to do that, we probably ought to
25 use our university system to become the premier nuclear

5

1 university system in the world, so that when and if we
2 need to, all the things that are being paid attention to
3 are paid attention to by people who are Nevadans who

4 care and can be engaged in the process on a daily basis.

5 The third part is a benefits process. The
6 benefits process is probably in three things as well.
7 First and foremost is water, second is land, and the
8 third is the opportunity for the whole host of economic
9 opportunities that spread across the -- that result from
10 the imposition of this repository being built in the
11 state of Nevada.

12 Let me explain. Water is the key element of
13 this. We don't have enough water, and water resources
14 are going to stay scarce. With enough thought, we can
15 probably find ways for water to become more plentiful by
16 desalinization of water on the coast and using large
17 amounts of water from the Pacific to alleviate needs
18 that draw from the Colorado River system and take a
19 whole 'nother look at the compact in the western
20 United States and where we get water from.

21 There's a lot of water in the Pacific we can
22 draw to, which, ironically, is no farther from Nevada
23 than the water straw that's being looked at to be built
24 from northern Nevada. So if that's the case, let's get
25 water where there's a lot of it, and we're not going to

6

1 take it from somebody else, and that can be of benefit.
2 That's the water issue.

3 As you're well aware, land in Nevada is
4 primarily publicly -- primarily controlled by the public

5 to the tune of, what, 87 percent or whatever it is. If
6 we want more of that as Nevadans, a stroke of the pen
7 from the Administration can give that to the State of
8 Nevada and be put to good use for tax base, economic
9 development, whatever. These are things well within the
10 authority of the Administrative Branch to cooperate with
11 the state and all the federal entities to do that.

12 The third part is the economic development
13 capacity. We ought to put to good use the opportunities
14 that come with this, whether it be a tariff for the
15 emplacement, whether it be the industries that are
16 associated with the repository, or advanced fuel
17 recycling, whatever comes to pass.

18 The point is is that we as Nevadans have never
19 had the full range of policy debates that are necessary
20 to be able to discuss this on an informed intellectual
21 basis and come up with reasons and solutions as to what
22 it is that can be done, what's in the art of doable.

23 And we don't have to do it all overnight. We
24 can build a four-lane highway from Las Vegas to Reno.
25 We can tie San Francisco to Reno, to Las Vegas, to

7

1 Los Angeles with rail lines. We can tie the -- we can
2 build a four-lane highway that goes from Phoenix. All
3 these things impact the economic viability of our -- of
4 the state of Nevada, the southwest United States, and
5 those things that go with that.

6 There are enough smart people in this state to

7 be able to deal with these things, prioritize them, and
8 put them in a way that makes sense. If Yucca Mountain
9 is going to happen, and I think it should, then we ought
10 to be capitalizing in the opportunities that are there.
11 Thank you for your time.

12 CHARLES HOLLIS: Charles Gary Hollis,
13 H-O-L-L-I-S. I'm in here today to support the
14 Yucca Mountain project. I think it's good for Nevada. I
15 think it's good for Nye County. As a Nye County
16 commissioner, we have two resolutions that the board has
17 done in the past to support DOE in their effort to make
18 Yucca Mountain happen and, also, to make it safe for the
19 citizens of Nye County.

20 One thing I'd like to put on the record is the
21 misstatements made by some people in the state and
22 congress calling Yucca Mountain a dump. Yucca Mountain
23 is not a dump, it's a repository. People don't put
24 their money in dumps. They put their money in banks.
25 Banks is a repository.

8

1 So if you're calling Yucca Mountain a dump,
2 then you must go and put your money in one. So, again,
3 as a commissioner of Nye County, I'm in support of
4 Yucca Mountain, and I support DOE wholeheartedly in
5 their effort to bring Yucca Mountain to Nye County.

6 PHILLIP KLEVORICK: Their legend is incorrect.
7 I'm describing Executive Summary S-11, figure S-5. First

8 of all, standard gage rail, this is not standard gage rail
9 in here. This is 11-foot rail apparently that's supposed
10 to be built, which is Transport and Emplacement Vehicle
11 rail. The legend indicating this is wrong.

12 Second thing is from my understanding, there's
13 supposed to be five portals or five phases of
14 development. And I believe there's only indicated four,
15 so I think there's actually five.

16 Third thing is we don't know what these points
17 on the map indicate. You may want to describe it as
18 Triangular B. I don't know what they are. They're not
19 on the legend. We don't know what they are.

20 And I'm going to call this the flying seagull,
21 because we don't know what that is either. It's on the
22 north central part of the map. However you guys want to
23 record that would be fine.

24 Rail lines are improperly described, points on
25 the map not described in the legend, and the legend as

9

1 indicated is wrong describing points on the map.

2 --oOo--

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11 transcription; and the foregoing transcript constitutes a
12 full, true and accurate record of such testimony adduced
13 and oral proceedings had, and of the whole thereof.

14 Witness my signature at Las Vegas, Nevada, on
15 this 14th day of November, 2007.

16

17

DAREN S. BLOXHAM

18

C.C.R. #685

19

20

21

22

23

24

25